

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 11-17 are pending. Claims 1, 8 and 15-17 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 11-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,314,569 (Chernock et al.).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an inserting unit which inserts into the image source an image marking including information that is used to display the network data synchronizing with displaying of the image source and which is extracted from the image source. In particular, the inserting unit (a) produces a feature file used for moving picture matching based on the image source, (b) inserts the image marking including a description about a location where the feature file is stored, into the image source, and (c) produces a synchronizing information script, generated with the feature file, said synchronizing information script showing when the network data are displayed and allowing identification of web contents related to points in the image source. Applicant submits that this feature is neither taught nor suggested in Chernock et al.

The Office Action took the position that the produced synchronizing information script is shown in Chernock et al. at col. 4, lines 56-66. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The synchronizing information script, as recited in claim 1, is generated with the feature file, shows when the network data are displayed, and allows identification of web contents related to points in the image source. On the other hand, the portion of Chernock et al. relied upon in the Office Action shows a provided Presentation Time Stamp (PTS), which show beginning and ending times of a “hole” specification, the hole being a portion of audio or video at which there is no significant audio or video activity. The fact that the hole

time stamp, i.e., the PTS, appears every frame to every third frame, is sufficient to use it for synchronization, since the frame rate is known. Col. 4, lines 56-62.

However, while the cited portion of Chernock et al. shows the PTS time stamp, discussed above, which may be useful for synchronization by virtue of the known frame rate, it does not teach or suggest the recited synchronization script that is generated with the feature file, shows when the network data are displayed, and allows identification of web contents related to points in the image source. As such, it is believed that a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been set forth in the Office Action. For at least this reason, claim 1 is believed patentable over Chernock et al.

Amended independent claims 8 and 15-17 recite a substantially similar feature and are believed patentable for similar reasons.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Dated: February 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph W. Ragusa  
Joseph W. Ragusa  
Registration No.: 38,586  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
41st Floor  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 835-1400  
Attorney for Applicant